

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on September 7, 2004, made final, has been carefully considered and the Examiner's remarks are appreciated. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-18, 21-23, 26, 29, 31, and 32 are pending in the application. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the Office Action, with support for the amendments found in the Specification, Claims, and Drawings.

Discussion of the Office Action

In the Office Action of September 7, 2004, claims 15-17 were allowed. Claims 1, 11-13, 18, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). And the Examiner objected to claims 4, 5, 8, 10, 14, 21, 22, 26, 29, and 32 as being dependent upon a rejected based claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Discussion of the Objections

Applicants have adopted the Examiner's suggestion by rewriting claims 4, 14, 21, 26, and 32 in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and are therefore assumed to now be allowable. Applicants also respectfully submit that claims 5, 8, and 10; claims 22 and 22; and claim 29 are also allowable for being dependent on now allowable independent claims 4, 14, and 26, respectively.

Discussion of the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 11-13, 18, 23, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,700,214 to Link. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 18 and 23 to clarify the distinctions from the prior art. In claim 1, for example, the *“flexible cantilever means”* now includes the limitation of being *“centripetally extending into the passageway...”* to perform its function of holding the pin in contact with the sheet and restraining the pin from translating with respect to the chip. Moreover, this centripetally extending configuration causes the flexible cantilever means to be curvilinearly deflectable by the pin *“in the direction of pin insertion into the passageway.”* In contrast, the Link reference in Figure 4 shows a contact 50 vertically extending into the socket opening 62, and not centripetally extending into the socket opening. And due to this arrangement, the contact 50 in the Link reference is deflectable in a direction transverse to the direction of pin insertion, and not in the same direction of pin insertion. Independent claims 18 and 23 include similar amended language as amended claim 1. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 18, and 23 are now allowable as amended. In addition, it is submitted that claims 11-13 and 31 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on now allowable base claims 1 and 23, respectively. Therefore, the 102(b) based rejections of claims 1, 11-13, 18, 23, and 31 should be withdrawn.

Summary

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-18, 21-23, 26, 29, 31, and 32 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 10-18, 21-23, 26, 29, 31 and 32.

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, he is respectfully requested to initiate the same with the undersigned at (925) 422-7274.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1-7-05

By: 

James S. Tak
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,367

Lawrence Livermore National Lab
7000 East Avenue, L-703
Livermore, CA 94550
TEL: (925) 422-7274
FAX: (925) 423-2231